

REMARKS

Claims 1-96 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-96 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 12, 23, 37, 46, 55, 65, 73, 81 and 89 have been amended.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-96 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Farrand et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,309,563 (Farrand).

As amended, claim 1 recites, “An inter-module communication comprising: customer relations management system information; and a message, wherein said message comprises said customer relations management system information, and at least a portion of said message is encoded in a markup language.” Applicant respectfully submits that Farrand fails to disclose that “at least of portion of said message is encoded in a markup language.”

Farrand does not disclose any type of document, communication or message encoded in a markup language, and in fact, completely fails to discuss markup languages in any context. The specification describes markup language (markup) as follows, “Markup encodes a description of the document’s storage layout and logical structure.” (page 8, lines 25-26). Farrand does not show, teach or suggest anything comparable to a message encoded in a markup language because Farrand does not disclose encoding a description of a document’s storage layout and logical structure.

Furthermore, Farrand could not be expected to disclose or implement encoding at least a portion of a message in a markup language because Farrand sets forth a protocol that does not necessitate the use of a markup language. Messages encoded in a markup language are typically

transmitted via standard network protocols. (see specification, pages 8 to 11). According to one embodiment of the present invention, “the only link between the two modules is the communication channel provided by HTTP, TCP/IP and related protocols.” (page 14, lines 3-6). In contrast, Farrand’s protocol provides “local data transfers between a system manager” by implementing a “bus master interface.” (column 2, lines 55-60). “The bus master interface provides the necessary interface for communications between the various components of the system manager and...the network operating system. To permit communications between the two, the bus master interface includes a pair of doorbell registers...a semaphore register...[and] mailbox registers.” (column 11, lines 60 to column 12, line 55). The communications interface in Farrand is the bus master interface, which is dissimilar from a standard network protocol and therefore would not suggest the use of a markup language to transfer information.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that claim 1 is now further distinguished from Farrand. Applicant submits that these arguments apply with equal force to independent claims 12, 23, 37, 46, 55, 65, 73, 81 and 89. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 12, 23, 37, 46, 55, 65, 73, 81 and 89, as well as claims 2-11, 12-22, 24-36, 38-45, 47-54, 56-64, 66-72, 74-80, 82-88 and 90-96, which depend on claims 1, 12, 23, 37, 46, 55, 65, 73, 81 and 89, are allowable for at least the foregoing reasons. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections based upon 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-96 are in condition for allowance.

Applicants also submit that claim 2, which is distinguishable over Farrand for the reasons previously discussed, is further distinguishable over Farrand because Farrand does not teach that the customer relations management system information includes “agent information” or “work item information,” as recited in claim 2. According to the Office Action, Farrand teaches “agent

information” in column 4, lines 3-12. (Office Action, dated Feb. 4, 2005, page 4). Column 4, lines 3-12 of Farrand state: “Through this interconnection between the system manager and the network management agent, the network management agent may supply information to or receive information collected by the system manager. Object management by the system manager may, therefore, be initiated by the network management agent if the network management agent issues instructions to create, delete, modify, reset, or clear objects stored in the system manager.”


While the network management agent can “supply information to or receive information collected by the system manager,” Farrand does not disclose that such communications comprise “agent information.” In fact, nothing in the foregoing citation from Farrand shows, teaches or suggests a message or communication comprising “agent information.”

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 2 distinguishes over Farrand by reciting that “said customer relations management system information comprises at least one of agent information and work item information.” Applicants submit that the foregoing arguments apply with equal force to claims 13, 24, 38, 47, 56, 66, 74, 82 and 90. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 2, 13, 24, 38, 47, 56, 66, 74, 82 and 90 are allowable for at least the foregoing reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections based upon 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5086.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on May 27, 2005.

  
Attorney for Applicants

5/27/05  
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



D'Ann Naylor Rifai  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 47,026  
Telephone: (512) 439-5086  
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099